



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,960	08/16/2000	Ligy Kurian	COMP:0080	6120

7590 10/21/2005

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
LEGAL DEPT., M/S 35
PO BOX 272400
FT. COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CALLAHAN, PAUL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/639,960

Applicant(s)

KURIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Callahan

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15, 17-28 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11 and 25-28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-15 and 17-24, 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.
2. Claims 1-9, 11-15, 17-28, and 31-33 are pending in the instant application and have been examined.

Specification

3. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: There is no antecedent basis for the phrase: "second communication dongle". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 24 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims each contain the limitation of a dongle or dongles that "use Bluetooth™ technology" The phrase is broad to the extent that it does not specify what specific elements of the broad field of technology that falls under the category of Bluetooth™ technology are utilized in the dongle or dongles.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

7. Claims 12-15, and 19-24, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Bork, US 6,255,800 B1.

Regarding claim 12, Bork teaches a wireless communication system for a computer comprising: a dongle, having a USB connector, an antenna, and a transceiver coupled to the USB connector and the antenna, wherein the dongle is configured to enable the USB connector to be connected to a recessed USB port of a computer (abstract, fig. 10 items 42, 44, 12, fig. 12, col. 7 lines 23-25).

Regarding claim 13, Bork teaches the transceiver is an integrated circuit utilizing Bluetooth™ technology (fig. 12 item 46).

Regarding claim 14, Bork teaches the integrated circuit is disposed within the dongle (fig. 11 item 44).

Regarding claim 15, Bork teaches the dongle having a protective cover extending over the antenna and integrated circuit (fig. 11 item 46, 42).

Regarding claim 19, Bork teaches a method of communicating information wirelessly between components of a computer system, comprising: inserting a USB connector of a first communication dongle having a first antenna into a recessed USB port of a computer; communicating with a first component of the computer system via the first communication dongle (fig. 11 item 12, fig. 14 items 42, 46, and 50, col. 5 lines 50-67).

As for claims 20 and 22, Bork teaches the wireless system includes more than one communicant which would include a duplicate of the first which would include therefore a second transceiver (col. 3 lines 1-25, col. 5 lines 35-51).

Regarding claim 21, Bork teaches disposing a first transceiver in the first communication dongle (fig. 11 item 44).

As for claims 23 and 24, Bork teaches configuring the first and second communication dongles to transmit and receive information according to a wireless communications protocol that uses Bluetooth™ technology (col. 5 lines 35-51).

Art Unit: 2137

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 17, 18, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bork.

Regarding claims 17, 18, and 31, Bork teaches a system comprising: a first device having a USB port; and a dongle operable to enable the first device to communicate wirelessly with a second device (fig. 14 items 46, 50), the dongle comprising: a USB connector for connecting the dongle to the USB port of the first device (fig. 11 item 12); and an antenna coupled to the USB connector (fig. 11 item 42). Bork does not specifically teach that the first or second device is a printer, however he does teach that the Bluetooth™ dongle can attach to peripheral devices (col. 3 lines 30-35). Such devices are very commonly printers. Therefore Official Notice may be taken of the use of a Bluetooth™ communication device that is a printer as common in the art at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized a device such as a printer in the system of Bork. Motive to make this combination is found for example at col. 3 lines 30-35 as discussed supra.

Regarding claim 32, Bork teaches the dongle comprises a transceiver coupled to the USB connector and the antenna (fig. 11 items 44, 12).

Regarding claim 33, Bork teaches the dongle uses Bluetooth™ wireless technology (fig. 11 item 44).

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 1-9, 11, and 25-28 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2137

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

10-12-05

Paul Callahan

E. Moise
EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER